

(JIND CIRCLE)

The 19th December, 1979

No 236.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be required to be taken by Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, Bata to Brahminiwala Road, Tehsil Narwana, District Jind, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the said section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking, with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested, who has any objection to the acquisition of any land in the locality, may within 10 days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing, before the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality Hadbast No.	Area in Acres	Remarks
Jind	Narwana	Batta (15)	7.41	1632, 1633, 1633, 1634, 1635, 1636, 1 1637, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1641, 1642, 1644, 1645, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1697, 1698, 1699, 1700, 1708, 1728, 1729, 1730, 1736, 1737, 1738, 1739, 1740, 2965, 2971, 2990, 2992, 2993, 2994, 2995, 2996, 3001, 3003, 3004, 3005, 3006, 3007, 3023, 3024, 3025, 3139, 3146, 3147, 3138, 3149, 3166, 3170, 3171, 3172, 3173, 3174, 3175.

No. 237.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that the land is likely to be required to be taken by the Government, at the public expense, for a public purpose, namely, constructing a road on Khark Ram Ji to Brahminiwala Road, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

It is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provision of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the said section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking, with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to acquisition of any land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATIONS

Name of District	Name of Tehsil	Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Khasra Nos.
Jind	Jind	Khark Ram Ji	68	2.83	164, 172, 214, 330/1, 330/2, 331, 332, 333, 334, 336, 337, 349, 350, 381, 352, 380, Rasta, 382, 167, 422, 426, 427, 428, 432, 433, 438, 437, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 437, 166, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, Rasta, 465, Rasta, 473, Rasta, 525, 526, 527, 528, 625,

Name of District	Name of Tehsil	Name of village	Hadbast No	Area in acres	Khasra Nos.
Jind	Jind	Kharkh Rani Ji—conold	66 conold		<div> <div>626, 530, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632,</div> <div>2</div> <div>633, 634, 637, 638, 639, 643, 644, 645, 646,</div> <div>56</div> <div>650, 651, 652, 654, 655, 656, 657,</div> <div>12, 22</div> <div>658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666,</div> <div>667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 675, 531, 532, 533,</div> <div>534, 535, 536, 168/1, Johar, Rasta, 539, 554,</div> <div>Rasta, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562,</div> <div>694, 695, 696, 697, 700, 701, 703, Rasta, 709,</div> <div>44</div> <div>710, 713, 714, 177, 715, 194,</div> <div>22/1, 22/2, 23/1,</div> <div>44</div> <div>43</div> <div>23/2, 24/1, 24/2, 25/1, 25/2</div> <div>16, 21/1, 21/2,</div> <div>43</div> <div>22/1, 22/2, 23/1, 23/2, 24/1, 24/2, 778, 169,</div> <div>43</div> <div>42</div> <div>186, 25/1, 25/2</div> <div>14, 15, 16, 17, 18/1, 18/2,</div> <div>42</div> <div>41</div> <div>Rasta, 19, 20/1, 21, 22</div> <div>6/1, 6/2, Rasta 7, 8,</div> <div>41</div> <div>11/1, 11/2, 12/1, 12/2, Khal, 735, Rasta, 13, 14</div> <div>40</div> <div>1, 2, 737, 3/1, 3/2, 26, 4/1, 4/2, 5, 9, 10</div> <div>37</div> <div>24, 25, 185</div> </div>
Jind	Jind	Assan	4	5.50	<div>71</div> <div>70</div> <div>25</div> <div>21, 22, 23/1, 23/2, 24, 25</div> <div>69</div> <div>68</div> <div>21, 22, 23, 24, 25</div> <div>21, 22, 23, 18, 17, 14,</div> <div>68</div> <div>24, 16, 15, 6/1/1, 6/2/1, 5/1, 5/2, 6/2/2</div> <div>67</div> <div>55</div> <div>56</div> <div>1</div> <div>25</div> <div>2, 3, 9/1, 9/2, 11, 12, 19,</div> <div>56</div> <div>47</div> <div>20/1, 20/2, 21/1, 21/2</div> <div>4, 7, 8/1, 13, 18, 22,</div> <div>47</div> <div>36</div> <div>166, 165, 164, 163, 315, 316,</div> <div>Johar</div> <div>24</div>

Name of District	Name of Tehsil	Name of village	Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Khasra Nos.
Jind	Jind	Assan— concl'd	4— concl'd		317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 37 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333 —, 153, 26 155, 19, 12, 9, 8, 156, 186, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, Rasta, 205, Rasta, 238, 239, 240, Rasta, 261, 262, 263, 264, Rasta, 38 1, 2, 3, 4/1, 4/2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 167 25 15, 16, 427, 17, 23, 24, 25 24 20 1, 2, 10/1, 10/2, 11, 426, 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 20 13, 177, 18, 19, 21, 22, 176, 174, 184, 424 7 16, 422, 17, 24/1, 24/2, Rasta, 25, 6, 15, 423, 7 6 5 72 Rasta 1/1, 10, 11 20, 21 5 73 74 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 1, 2, 3, 4, Khal 5 75 1, 2, 3, 4/1, 4/2 188, 183, Main Rasta 90 112 254, Main Rasta 167, 18, 23 2, 9, 12, 826 1 12 13 17, 23, 24 3, 253, 8, 12, 13, 19, 22 2, 9
Total Area .. 9.05					

The 27th December, 1979

No. 238.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that land below is needed by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, Mohal Khera Link Road, tehsil Narwana, district Jind, it is therefore, hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the aforesaid purpose.

This declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, P.W.D., B.&R. Branch, Ambala Cantt. is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

Plans of land may be inspected in the office of the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt. and Executive Engineer, Hansi Provincial Division, Narwana.

SPECIFICATION

District	Taluk	Village and Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Rectangle/ Killa No.		
Jind	Narwana	Mohel Khara (38)	2.28	42	42	
				18/9	19	
				7, 21, 22		
				46	47	
				5, 6, 7, 13, 19	1	
				57		
				3, 8, 9, 11, 12		

(Sd.)

Superintending Engineer,
Jind Circle, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch,
Jind.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 30th November, 1979

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/15496 — In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in the matter of the dispute between the management of M/s Frick India Ltd., Main Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 90 of 1979

between

SHRI BANSIDHAR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S FRICK INDIA
LIMITED, MAIN MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—Workman in person.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 1D/FD/28-79/12601, dated 17th March, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Frick India Limited, Main Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Bansidhar Singh, to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services Shri Bansidhar Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared but the dispute was settled. The workman received a sum of Rs. 168-35 in cash before this Tribunal

in full and final settlement and agreed not to claim reinstatement or re-employment or any other claim. I, therefore, give my award that the dispute has been settled and, therefore, is no dispute between the parties at present.

The 16th November, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1123, dated 21st November, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3 Lab-79/15497.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Injecto Pvt. Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

**BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 41 of 1978

between

**SHRI UMA DUTT SHARMA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S INJECTO
PRIVATE LIMITED, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD**

Present :

Shri S. R. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/346-77/6681, dated 13th February, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Injecto Private Limited, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Uma Dutt Sharma, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Uma Dutt Sharma, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on the 7th July, 1978 :—

- (1) Whether the raising of demand directly on the management is inevitable? If not, to what effect?
- (2) Whether the workman abandoned his services of his own?
- (3) Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

3. And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri Shiv Shankar Khator, their Commercial Manager as MW-1, who stated that the workman was granted leave,—vide Ex. M-1 from 4th May, 1977 to 14th May, 1977 and had to join duty on 16th May, 1977, but he did not join. They issued a recalled notice on 18th May, 1977 Ex. M-2 and another letter Ex. M-3. Then they sent to the workman full and final account. He proved documents Ex. M-4 to M-17. He stated that they had agreed to pay retrenchment compensation and one month's wages as per section 25(f) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The management also examined Shri G. D. Sharma, their Time Office Incharge as MW-2, who also stated that the workman was on leave from 4th May, 1977 to 14th May, 1977 and the workman did not turn up. The workman attended their office on 8th June, 1977. He asked the workman the reasons of his absence. The workman did not give any such reason. He then

asked him to produce a sick certificate. He told the management about the arrival of the workman but the management told him that the name of the workman has been struck off as per the Standing Orders. The workman examined himself as W-1, who stated that he was sick when his leave expired. He produced medical certificates Ex. W-1 and W-2 and fitness certificate Ex. W-3. He has also produced Ex. W-4 and W-5 the postal receipt regarding registered letters. One seal bearing date 27th May, 1977 which proves that the medical certificate dated 27th May, 1977 was sent under it. Ex. W-4 another postal receipt might relate to Ex. W-2 the medical certificate dated 16th May, 1977. Ex. W-3 is fitness certificate.

3. I have gone through all the evidence, oral as well as documentary. I have also heard arguments by the representatives of both the parties at length. The representative for the management argued that any remaining absent after the leave period expired the workman has abandoned his services as per the Standing Orders and these Standing Orders provide that if the workman shall remain absent or overstays leave shall automatically lose his lien on his appointment unless he returned within ten days of his absence or the expiry of the sanctioned leave. He further argued that the workman did not explain to the satisfaction of the management his inability to resume his duty in time and therefore, the workman has lost his lien on the job and has abandoned his job of his own. He could cite no ruling in support of his contention. The representative for the workman argued that inference of abandonment of service could be drawn when it is intentional abandonment is an intentional act. He further argued that when the workman went on duty on 8th June, 1977, the management should have been enquired from him the reasons of overstay and should have also even a show of enquiry. The management did not do that. The representative for the management replied this argument by arguing that the management had asked him to give medical certificate but the workman had no medical certificate with him and he did not produce any. The representative for the management further argued that the medical certificate Ex. W-1, W-2 and W-3, are not genuine.

4. The representative for the workman cited 1979 1 LLN page 331 (S. C.) 77 1 LLN 593 Bombay 1978 11 LLN 173 (M. P.), 1978 1 LLJ page 460 Gujarat in support of his arguments and contention. I have gone through all these rulings.

5. Although abandonment can be inferred if the circumstance of the case warrant that. In this case when there are two medical certificates Ex. W-1 and W-2 covering the period of overstay of the part of the workman dated 16th May, 1977 and 27th May, 1977, and there is fitness certificate dated 7th June, 1977 I cannot draw inference of abandonment. These certificates prove that the workman was ill from 16th May, 1977 to 6th June, 1977 or 7th June, 1977. When a person is ill or in helpless condition, which may not enable him to join his duties, inference of abandonment can not be drawn. The arguments of the representative for the management that the medical certificates are not genuine, do not hold good with me. The medical certificates bore the seal of the Doctor and his signatures. The Doctor is a registered one.

6. From the evidence discussed above and from the circumstances of the case, I do not draw inference of abandonment on the part of the workman. I, therefore, decide issue No. 2 against the management.

Issue No. 1.—It is now well settled law if the demand is not raised directly with the management, the dispute and the reference is not bad. I, therefore, decide this issue against the management.

Issue No. 3.—As per my findings on issue No. 2, I am of the opinion that the management has terminated the services of the workman. The management has not proved justification of termination. I, therefore, find issue No. 3 also against the management.

7. As a result of my findings on the issues, while answering the reference, I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

The 16th November, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1124, dated the 21st November, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/15498.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Radhika Rubber Products (P) Ltd., Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 181 of 1979

between

SHRI MUSAFIR RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S RADHIKA RUBBER
PRODUCTS (P) LIMITED, SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri P. K. De, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 136-78/25252, dated 13th June, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Radhika Rubber Products (P) Limited, Sector-6, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Musafir Ram, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Musafir Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared but the dispute was settled. The workman received all his dues amounting to Rs. 1,000 only. I, therefore, give my award that the dispute has been settled and there is no dispute at present.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated The 16th November, 1979.

o. 1122, dated the 21st November, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 6th December, 1979

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16185.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Nagar Palika, Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 95 of 1979

Between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/s. NAGAR PALIKA, BHIWANI

Present :—

None, for the workmen.

Shri Ram Kumar for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. ID/HSR/43-78/12178, dated 16th March, 1979 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Nagar Palika Bhiwani and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 : -

Whether the class IVth employees should be given medical allowance ? If so, with what details ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared on 6th August, 1979. Then the case was fixed for 25th September, 1979. On 26th September, 1979 none appeared for the workmen and the representative for the management had appeared at 12-35 p. m. when the case had been called earlier. Notices were again issued for 25th October, 1979. On that date no workman appeared but the representative for the management appeared. The case was dismissed in default. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

The 29th November, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1157, dated 6th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 11th December, 1979

No. 11 (112)-3 Lab-79/16174.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Rai Brass Enterprises, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 473 of 1978

between

SHRI NAND LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. RAI BRASS ENTERPRISES, 3 N. H., N. I. T., FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Roshan Lal Sharma, for the workman.

None for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/11/152-78/46217, dated 12th October, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Rai Brass Enterprises, 3 N. H., N. I. T., Faridabad and its workman Shri Nand Lal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 : —

Whether the termination of services of Shri Nand Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The representative for the workman appeared. The management did not appear. The case was fixed for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman for 9th April, 1979 on which date the Presiding Officer was on leave. Then

the case was again fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman on 15th May, 1979. The representative or the workman obtained three adjournments for adducing the evidence of the workman but adduced nil. On 13th August, 1979, it was specifically ordered that in case the workman did not adduce this evidence on 23th September, 1979, his evidence shall be deemed to have been closed. On 28th September, 1979 the case was adjourned to 24th October, 1979 for the evidence of the workman as per orders dated 13th August, 1979. Thereafter the representative for the workman obtained another adjournment. It was again adjourned for 19th November, 1979. On 19th November, 1979 also the workman did not examine any witness, nor he appeared. His evidence was closed.

3. In this case the workman led no evidence at all. The workman has made innumerable defaults, laches and delay and even could not examine himself as his own witness. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of the workman is justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

Dated the 30th November, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1165, dated 6th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 11th December, 1979

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16178. —In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bharj Enterprises, Plot No. 17, Sector-6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 182 of 1978

between

SHRI VIJAY KUMAR, WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHARJ ENTERPRISES,
PLOT NO. 17, SECTOR-6, FARIDABAD

Present .—

Shri Bhim Singh Yadav, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua for, the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. FD/38-B/78/30330, dated 4th July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Bharj Enterprises, Plot No. 17, Sector-6, Faridabad and its workman Shri Vijay Kumar, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Vijay Kumar was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. The following issues were framed on 15th December, 1978 :—

(1) Whether the workman resigned his job of his own?

(2) If issue No. 1 is not proved whether the termination of services of workman was justified and in order?

(3) If not, to what relief is he entitled?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. Two adjournments were obtained by the management. Lastly the management examined Shri Pritam Singh Bharaj, their proprietor as MW-1 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman, who examined one Shri Piare Lal, as WW-1 and then the case was fixed for remaining evidence of the workman. Lastly a settlement was arrived at. According to which the management paid to the workman a sum of Rs 1,100 only on 13th November, 1979, for which the workman executed a receipt in favour of the management and gave it to them. The workman shall not be entitled to reinstatement or re-employment. The workman's representative admitted before this Tribunal that the said sum was paid to the workman by the management and there was no dispute. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of the workman is justified and in order. He has received a sum of Rs 1,100 only from the management in full and final settlement and satisfaction of all the claims, dues and disputes. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

Dated the 30th November, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1155, dated 6th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16180.-- In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Bharaj Enterprises, Plot No. 17, Sector-6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No 322 of 1978

between

SHRI PHOOL SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BHARAJ
ENTERPRISES, PLOT NO. 17, SECTOR-6, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri Hari Singh Yadav, for the workman.

H. R. Dua, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/54-78/37296, dated 9th August, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Bharaj Enterprises, Plot No. 17, Sector-6, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Phool Singh to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Phool Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 18th June, 1979:—

(1) Whether the workman tendered his resignation and the same was accepted by the management?

- (2) Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order ?
- (3) Relief.

And the case was fixed for evidence of the management. The management obtained two adjournments and lastly did not appear. Then *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management. But thereafter the management made an application to set aside the *ex parte* proceedings against them which were set aside subject to payment of costs. Costs were paid. Thereafter a settlement was arrived at between the parties. According to which the workman received a sum of Rs 1,100 before this Tribunal from the management and gave up his right to reinstatement or re-employment and all other claims or rights. I, therefore, give my award in terms of the settlement that the dispute has been settled and is no more in existence. The workman has received a sum of Rs 1,100 only in full and final settlement and satisfaction of all his claims, dues and dispute. The workman is not entitled to reinstatement or re-employment. The termination of services of the workman is, in the circumstances, justified and in order.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated 30th November, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1102, dated 6th December, 1979.

Forwarded, (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-314L-75/10182.— In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Supreme Engineering Industries (P) Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 292 of 1978

between

SHRI RANJEET SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SUPREME
ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES (P) LTD., MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Workman in person.

None, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. ID/ED/8-N-78/34340, dated 21st July, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Supreme Engineering Industries (P) Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Ranjeet Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ranjeet Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order or reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 4th June, 1979:—

- (1) Whether the workman abandoned his job of his own?

- (2) Whether the workman was estopped from raising the dispute ?
- (3) Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order ?
- (4) Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management obtained three adjournments but did not lead any evidence. Notices were again sent to the parties. The workman appeared but the management did not appear despite service of notice. The case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman, proceeding against the management *ex parte*. The workman examined himself as his own witness and stated that the management removed him from service without any cause, whereas his work was satisfactory. He had fallen ill and got treatment and had produced medical certificates to the management by registered post and termination of service was unjustified.

3. I believe in the *ex parte* statement of the workman and give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages.

Dated the 30th November, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1160, dated the 6th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16183.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Fibre Processors Pvt. Ltd. Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference Nos. 266 of 1979

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S FIBRE PROCESSORS PVT. LTD.,
FARIDABAD

Present .—

None, for the workmen.
Shri Satish Ahuja, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. FD/149-79/36897, dated 24th August, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Fibre Processors Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad and its workmen to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act :—

Whether the termination of services of the workmen shown in Annexure "A" is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties, which had been served on both the parties. The representative for the management appeared but none appeared for the workmen. Therefore, the case was dismissed in default on 15th October, 1979. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 29th November, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1159, dated 6th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal,
Haryana, Faridabad.

ANNEXURE "A"

Serial No.	Name
1	Shri Dasu.
2	Shri Baij Nath.
3	Shri Ram Parshad.
4	Shri Ram Dul Raj.
5	Shri Munne.
6	Shri Nanku.
7	Shri Phul Chand.
8	Shri Mohmad Ali.
9	Shri Daya Ram.
10	Shri Lal Ji.
11	Shri Rama Nand.
12	Shri Sobh Nath.
13	Shri Ramjit.
14	Shri Ganesh Parshad.
15	Shri Ram Pher.
16	Shri Bachhan Singh.
17	Shri Ram Ujagar.
18	Shri Parsu Ram.
19	Shri Ram Ball.
20	Shri Gori Shankar.
21	Shri Prahalad.
22	Shri Shiv Shankar.

No. 11(112)-3 Lab-79/16184.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Fabrication & Allied Products Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 206 of 1978

between

THE WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. FABRICATION AND ALLIED
PRODUCTS, PLOT 39, SECTOR-4, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri Hari Singh Yadav, for the workman

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. FD/251-77/31634, dated nil, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Fabrication & Allied Products, Plot 39, Sector-4, Faridabad and its workman

to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

1. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of bonus for the year 1975-76 ? If so, with what details ?
2. Whether the workmen should be supplied with uniforms ? If so, with what details ?
3. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of Additional Dearness Allowance ? If so, with what details ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman obtained five adjournments for filing claim statement and the management obtained four adjournments for filing written statement. Following issues were framed on 20th August, 1979 :—

1. Whether the dispute has been properly espoused by substantial number of workmen ?
2. Whether the workmen are entitled for bonus for the year 1975-76 ? If so, with what details ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. It was at this stage that the dispute was settled between the parties. And both the parties prayed that "No dispute" award may be given. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 30th November, 1979

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal,
Haryana, Faridabad

No. 1158, dated 6th December, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16186. -In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hind Ispat Foundry, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 252 of 1978

between

SHRI UDAYA BHAN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HIND ISPAT
FOUNDRY, PLOT NO. 18, SECTOR 24, FARIDABAD

Present:—

None, for the workman.

None, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. ID/33728, dated 19th July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Hind Ispat Foundry, Plot No. 18, Sector 24, Faridabad and its workman Shri Udaya Bhan, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Udaya Bhan was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and had filed pleadings. Thereafter the management did not appear. Then the case was fixed *ex-parte* against the management for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman. The workman obtained two adjournments for giving his *ex-parte* evidence, but did not adduce any evidence and on the last date of hearing, neither the workman appeared, nor his representative. The case was dismissed in default. The conduct of the workman shows that he is not interested in pursuing his dispute. And I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated 29th November, 1979.

No. 1156, dated 6th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16187.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Wood Crafts, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,

HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 64 of 1979

between

SHRI JAI NUL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HARYANA WOOD CRAFTS,
SECTOR-6, FARIDABAD

Present:—

None for the workman.

None for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 5-79/6533, dated 16th February, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Haryana Wood Crafts, Sector-6, Faridabad and its workman Shri Jai Nul, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

- Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Nul, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman filed his claim statement. The case was fixed for filing written statement by the management, but on the next date of hearing the management did not appear, although the representative for the workman appeared. The management was proceeded against *ex-parte* and the case was fixed for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman. Thereafter neither the workman appeared, nor his representative on the date fixed. The case was dismissed in default. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer, Industrial,
Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

Dated the 29th November, 1979.

No. 1155, Dated 6th December, 1972

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana Labour & Employment Departments Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act

NATHU RAY SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad

The 24th December, 1979

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16302.—in pursuance of the provision of section-17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (A.L.No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/S Auto Pins (India) Regd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAY SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No 289 of 1978

between

SHRI RAMJI YADAV, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S AUTO PINS
(INDIA) REGD., FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri P. K. De, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. 1 D/11-28-N-79/34381, dated 20th July, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Auto Pins (India) Regd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Ram Ji Yadav, to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Ji Yadav was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 15th January, 1979:—

1. Whether the workman was a probationer? If so, to what effect?
2. Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order?
3. If not, to what relief is he entitled?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri D. N. Ahuja, their Personnel Officer as MW-1 and Shri Jai Parkash Singh Chauhan, Time Keeper as MW-2 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as WW-1 and closed his case. Then the case was fixed for arguments. Arguments were heard. Now I give my findings issueswise:—

Issue No. 1.—MW-1 has stated that the workman was appointed as a probationer, *vide* Ex M-1 on 4th July, 1977 for a period of six months and his services were terminated on 7th January, 1978, *vide* Ex. M-3 as his work was not found satisfactory and the management terminated his services as per the Standing Orders. MW-2 also proved Ex. M-3. The workman admitted that he was appointed as helper on 4th July, 1977. He stated that his services were terminated for the reasons that he had formed a committee on 1st January, 1978. He admitted his signatures and receipt of Ex. M-1, the appointment letter, but stated that he did not receive the letter of termination of his services. I have gone through oral as well documentary evidence. The workman was appointed as a probationer on 4th July, 1977 for a period of six months and on the expiry thereof his services were terminated on 7th January, 1978 after six months. His work was not satisfactory and therefore, the management could terminate his services and terminated. I decide issue No. 1 in favour of the management.

Issue No. 2.—I also decide issue No. 2 in favour of the management, as his services has been terminated after the expiry of the probationer period when his work was not found satisfactory.

Issue No. 3.—The workman is not entitled to any relief. I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was justified and an order. He is not entitled to any relief.

Dated the 29th November, 1979

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 1169, dated the 7th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

—NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/16303.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Auto Pins (India) Regd. (Plant-II), Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 130 of 1978

between

SHRI RAM NIWAS, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. AUTO PINS
(INDIA) REGD. (PLANT-II), FARIDABAD.

Present :

Shri P. M. De, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

1. By Order No. ID/FD/26-M/17816, dated 10th May, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Auto Pins (India) Regd. (Plant-II), Faridabad, and its workman Shri Ram Niwas, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Niwas was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed, on 15th January, 1979:—

(1) Whether the workman was a probationer ? If so, to what effect ?

(2) Whether the termination of services of the workman was justification and in order ?

(3) If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri S. S. Sharma, their Time Keeper as MW-1 and Shri D. N. Ahuja, their Personnel Officer as MW-2. The workman examined himself as WW-1. Both the parties had closed their case. Then the case was fixed for arguments. Arguments were heard. Now I give my findings issueswise :—

Issue No. 1.—The workman was appointed as probationer for a period of six months,—*vide* Ex. M-1, dated 11th July, 1977. His services were terminated,—*vide* Ex. M-2, dated 18th January,

1978, after six months, i. e. after the expiry of the probationary period. MW-1 stated that plant No. 2 was purchased by another management in October, 1978 and the new management had taken on their rolls those workmen only who were on rolls on 1st October, 1978. The new management was not liable to keep in employment those workmen who were out of the factory on 1st October, 1978. The workman admitted Ex. M-1. He simply stated that he was terminated for being a member of the union. The letter of appointment mentions that the services of the workman could be terminated at any time during or at the end of the probationary period without assigning any reason or notice. The workman had accepted this term of appointment. More over this plant in which the workman was working had been sold to another management. The services of the workman had been terminated in the month of January, 1978 and the new management could not take the workman on duty as he was not on duty when the plant was sold, his services had been terminated earlier. I, therefore, decide issue No. 1 in favour of the management.

Issue No. 2.—The termination of services of the workman was justified as per the terms and conditions of letter of appointment and as per the standing orders. I decide this issue in favour of the management.

Issue No. 3.—The workman is not entitled to any relief. I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

Dated the 29th November, 1979.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 1168, dated 7th December, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

H. L. GUGNANI, Secy.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH
JIND CIRCLE

The 26th September, 1979

No. 325.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that the land is likely to be required to be taken by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely constructing a road from Jind Salidon Road to village Pindra. It is hereby notified that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the Officers, for the time being engaged in the undertaking, with their servants and workmen, to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested, who has any objection to acquisition of any land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file an objection, in writing, before the Land Acquisition Collector, Public Works, Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATION

Name of district	Name of tehsil	Name of village	Area in hectares	Khasara No.
Jind	Jind	Nirjan	1.23	59
				8/2/1, 13/1, 13/2, 18, 19, 22, 23
				71
				2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 13/1, 13/2 18/1 18/2, 19, 22/22/2
				78
				2/1, 2/2, 9/1/1. 9/1/2, 9/2, 12/1, 12/2, 19, 20, 21, 22.
				88
				1, 2, 9, 16, 11, 12, 19/1, 19/2, 20, 21/1, 21/2.
				94
				1/1, 1/2, 10/1, 10/2, 11/1, 11/2 19, 698, 115, 268, 118, 703, 701,
Jind	Jind	Pindara	1.94	8
				16, 25,
				9
				20/1, 20/2, 21/1, 21/2
				18
				1, 10, 11/1, 11/2, 20, 21,
				19
				5, 6/1, 6/2, 15/1, 15/2, 16, 25/1,
				19
				25/2, Rasta
				24
				5/1, 5/2, 6/1, 6/2, 15/1, 15/2,
				35
				4, 5, 7, 14,
				40
				4, 5, 68, 523, 72, 84, 85, 86
Total ..			3.17	

(Sd.)

Superintending Engineer,
Jind Circle P.W.D., B.&R., Branch,
Jind.